



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park
3000 Granny White Pike
Nashville, Tennessee 37204
Telephone: (615) 862-7970
Fax: (615) 862-7974

MEETING MINUTES November 18, 2009

Present were Commissioners: Chairperson Ann Nielson, Vice-chairperson Allen Decuyper, Doug Berry, Ben Mosley, Phil Ponder, Brian Tibbs, Judy Turner
Staff: Tim Walker, director; Robin Zeigler, zoning administrator, Sean Alexander, Matthew Schutz, Fred Zahn, Metro Attorney Doug Sloan
Applicants: Richard Amend, John Haas, Terry Rasmussen, Kevin Smith, Michael Ward, Mark West
Citizens: Burkley Allen, Nancy Chilton, Jane Hardy, Kren Teren, Axson West

With a quorum present, Chairperson Nielson called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice-chairperson DeCuyper moved to approve the minutes from the October 28, 2009 meeting. Commissioner Tibbs seconded the motion, and the motion passed without opposition.

Staff member, Sean Alexander, read aloud the process for appealing decisions made by the MHZC, Chairperson Nielson then moved to the Agenda.

III. NEW BUSINESS

110 Second Avenue North

Application: Signage

District: Second Avenue Historic Preservation District

Council District: 6

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case which was for installation of two signs to the First Avenue elevation of 110 Second Avenue. The signs will have painted text and graphics on sheet aluminum. There will be a twenty seven inch (27") tall by eighteen foot (18') wide, flush-mounted sign between the first and second stories, and a three-foot (3') tall and four-foot (4') wide projecting sign above the basement entrance. Mr. Alexander stated that the application met the design guidelines and that Staff recommended approval.

Commissioners asked a few questions about the location of the proposed signage.

Motion

Commissioner Tibbs moved to approve the application. Commissioner DeCuyper seconded the motion and it passed without opposition.

1708 Ashwood Avenue

Application: Rear addition, Reduced side setback

District: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation District

Council District: 18

Staff member, Robin Zeigler, presented the case for a rear addition at 1708 Ashwood, contributing house in the district. The addition is proposed to be a twenty-four foot by twenty-four foot (24' x 24') addition connected to the existing house by a six foot (6') vestibule. The height of the addition will be twenty-nine feet and six inches (29' 6"), approximately six feet (6') below the existing ridgeline. Because of the sloping grade of the lot, this one-story addition would have a walk-out basement. The basement level was designed to eventually serve as a two-car garage, although that will not be the immediate use of the space. The foundation line of the addition will match the foundation line of the existing house and the stone material will also match the existing stone foundation. The siding of the main portion of the addition will be painted brick to match the painted brick of the existing house. The garage openings and the connecting vestibule will be covered in hardi-panels and trim. The west side of the addition will include a shed roof bay with stucco siding, similar to the existing bay on the east side of the house. The gable roof will be asphalt shingle and include eave brackets similar to those on the existing house. The windows and doors will be aluminum clad wood and match the existing in design.

Staff explained that typically, rear additions which extend beyond the side wall of the historic house are discouraged; however, a portion of the view of this wall will be blocked by an existing stair and entry porch and the lot grade lowers dramatically from front to back, which will also lessen the impact of this addition.

Ms. Zeigler clarified that attached garages are discouraged for historic homes, except where historic examples exist or when the attached garage is in the general location of an historic garage. In this case, the proposed garage is in the general location of historic accessory buildings for this street, as seen on the 1931-32 Sanborn maps. In addition, this particular property had an accessory building in this general location, oriented to the alley.

In most cases, Ms. Zeigler stated, the design guidelines require that masonry not be painted; although, when painting of brick has been approved, the approved color has been the original brick color. Since the existing house has already been painted and painted with the proposed color, staff found that painting the new brick to match was appropriate.

The design of the addition mimics the design of the existing house in scale, architectural details, rhythm of solids to voids, roof form and materials, and the six foot (6') connecting vestibule helps the addition to read as a contemporary addition.

The required rear setback for an R8 zone should be twenty feet (20'); however only ten feet (10') is planned, stated Ms. Zeigler. Staff recommended approval of a reduction in setback since the side of the property in question fronts an alley, providing for ample space between this house and its neighbor, more than the space currently found between the majority of houses on this block.

There was no discussion and no public comment.

Motion

Commissioner Ponder moved to approve the application. Commissioner Berry seconded the motion and it passed without opposition.

2807 Belmont Boulevard

Application: Addition

District: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation District

Council District: 18

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case which was for modification and enlargement of an existing two-story rear addition and the construction of a new one-story rear addition to an historic brick Foursquare house. The added portions would be clad with a smooth-faced cement-fiber lap siding, and would have an asphalt shingle roof and a parged C.M.U. foundation.

A new six hundred ninety seven (697) sq. ft. garage was also proposed. The materials would match the proposed addition, and the structure will be one story tall and meet the existing minimum setback requirements.

By setting in the second story walls of the addition on both sides, stated Mr. Alexander, the applicant has clearly differentiated the addition from the historic structure, satisfying sections II.B.2.a. and II.B.2.e of the design guidelines.

Mr. Alexander explained that the lot is twice the standard width of lots in the district which allowed for the proposed type of side addition. The side addition meets section II.B.2.d because the original brick wall and the corner will be retained, and the front-facing wall of this portion of the addition will be mostly glass.

The materials of the proposed addition are compatible with the existing structure and have been approved by the MHZC on similar additions in the district, satisfying sections II.B.2.d. and II.B.2.f of the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of the addition and garage. Staff finds that the addition to meet II.B.2 (New Construction and Additions) of the *Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation District: Handbook and Design Guidelines* (BHDG), taking into account the existing rear addition and the dimensions and slope of the lot. Staff finds the garage to meet BHDG I.B.1.i. (Outbuildings).

Michael Ward, the architect for the project, explained that the owners have been in the home for seven years and wished to expand.

Commissioner Ponder asked if the proposed addition would undermine the property's National Register status. Mr. Alexander replied that it would not.

Commissioner DeCuyper asked if demolition of the existing rear addition was a part of the proposal and Mr. Alexander responded that it was.

Motion

Commissioner DeCuyper moved to approve the application, including demolition of the current rear addition and construction of the rear garage. Commissioner Ponder seconded the motion and it passed without opposition.

1516 Ordway Place

Application: New Construction

District: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation District

Council District: 6

Mr. Schutz presented the case for a new, two-story, mixed-use structure, clad in brick and metal, with a corner entrance.

Mr. Shutz stated that the overall massing and details of the proposed structure at 1516 Ordway Place match the patterns established by existing neighborhood commercial structures within Lockeland Springs-East End as required by the Design Guidelines. Staff recommended approval of the application with the condition that materials be approved and the limestone material at the base of the building pilasters be replaced or replicated such that the foundation material is consistent (all stone or all brick). Mr. Shutz explained that the applicant had agreed to these conditions.

Staff explained the proposed design was compared to existing historic commercial buildings in the district in terms of massing, orientation, and materials and found to be compatible. The steel panels proposed have not been approved before but are consistent with existing materials in terms of texture and color.

Richard Amend, the applicant and Mark West, architect for the project, provided the Commissioners with samples of the proposed materials and explained where they would be used.

Staff clarified that the Core 10 steel material should only be approved on a case-by-case basis and should come before the commission rather than being approved on the staff level. Since the material is secondary, and matches historic brick in terms of color and texture, Staff found that it was acceptable for this particular use on a commercial building.

Mr. Amend addressed the Commission's concerns about the steel staining the walls and sidewalk by describing a rain trough in the sill to control the runoff of the bleeding or having other areas bleed into a vegetated area.

Commissioner Mosley described his concern for the brick piers which look "taped up" onto the façade and recommended that the brick be capped in some way.

Commissioner Mosley asked what material was planned for the inside of the rear open areas. Mr. West said that they had not made a decision yet but that it would match the color palate of the building and might be perforated metal.

Mr. West explained that the steel sheets, set up to be a rain screen system, will be no wider than 3' to 4' and no taller than 5' to 6', to match the windows and be attached with exposed or concealed fasteners.

Limestone on the piers will be addressed.

Motion

Commissioner Mosley made the motion to approve with the conceptual design with the condition that material and construction details be approved at the staff level. Commissioner Tibbs seconded the motion and there was a unanimous vote to approve.

3501 Byron Avenue

Application: Demolition - Economic Hardship

District: Elmington Place Neighborhood Conservation District

Council District: 25

Staff member Matt Shutz provided background on the project including the contributing status of the school by reading from the Staff Recommendation the following information.

Ransom School, located at 3501 Byron Avenue is a contributing building to the Elmington Place Neighborhood Conservation District. It was most recently known as the Randall Learning Center but is currently vacant. The building is a 27,000 square-foot structure on 1.99 acres of land.

The oldest part of the building was constructed in 1918 as a county school and named for John B. Ransom, a prominent Nashville businessman and a cousin of

Medicus Ransom, who served as the school's first principal. The school was expanded in 1925 and became a part of the Nashville City School system in 1929. In 1932, a free-standing addition to the school facing Byron Avenue was constructed, which was designed by the noted Nashville architectural firm Warfield and Keeble. Additions to the school were also constructed in 1951 and 1955, which connected the two buildings adding a gymnasium and classrooms.

In 1957, the school became a part of Nashville's desegregation story. Ransom School was one of fifteen schools the City planned to desegregate and the school that then Mayor Ben West's son planned to attend.

In 1974 the school was closed and the building began its use as a Teachers Learning Center. The Learning Center was moved to a new location in 2007, and the building has been vacant since. The school has been deemed eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRE) since 2002 and is also identified as a historical resource in the Green Hills-Midtown Community Plan which was adopted by the Metro Planning Commission on July 28, 2005. Advent Land purchased the property from the Metropolitan Government on March 18, 2008. In February of 2009, the applicant representing Advent Land, applied to demolish the structure and made a case for economic hardship but was denied. The applicant applied again with additional information in October of 2009 but requested to be deferred a month in order to provide additional information requested by staff.

Staff member Robin Zeigler read the Staff Recommendation essentially as had been provided to the Commissioners. Changes presented are noted with underlines and strikethroughs:

In the analysis of Economic Hardship staff considered the viability of rehabilitation of the existing units and not the value of the post-demolition development. Staff found that the post-development information provided by the applicant did not have any bearing on the question of economic hardship for the existing buildings but acknowledges that this will be useful and necessary information to consider if economic hardship is found and demolition approved.

Because of the Specific Plan District zoning, 11 residential units are the only potential use of the property. The owner has the ability to develop apartments, condominium units, detached single-family homes or a combination of the three; however, the neighborhood has expressed opposition to rental units. In keeping the wishes of the neighborhood in mind, then condominium units are the only possible use of the existing buildings. With those restraints, the owner has considered three options: (option G) rehabilitation of one of the two buildings into 6 condominium units, demolishing the second and constructing 5 single-family homes; (option O) rehabilitation of both buildings into 5 condominium units and constructing 6 single-family homes; (option not labeled) rehabilitation of both of

the existing buildings into 11 condominium units. (See Attachment A for options O and G.)

In Attachment A, the applicant explains that options G and O are not feasible since the different configurations would provide for alternatives that “would not meet market expectations and be difficult to sell.” Both options are similar in that they assume approximately half of the 11 possible units will be single-family homes.

The third scenario is to rehabilitate the complex into 11 condominium units. The owner has determined that the total cost of rehabilitating the 11 units would be \$5,358,999 and the completed value would be \$5,032,170, resulting in a net loss of \$326,829. To illustrate how the costs were determined, the applicant has submitted a construction estimate based on a 3-bedroom 2.5-bathroom model with standard finishes (Unit 1 or 2), the majority of the proposed models. (See Attachment C for Construction Estimate and Attachment B for Units 1 or 2 floor plan.)

Taking into account that the cost per square foot of the proposed estimate is \$207, staff finds that the developer has undervalued the project. At the Commission’s request, the applicant provided a broad view of sell price comparables from low- to high-rise condominiums throughout Nashville. To gain a more workable view of this specific area, staff has narrowed the price of comparables to three- and two-bedroom condominium units, in mid-rise buildings, within 1.5 to 2 miles a mile of the property, that have sold recently (May 2009-October 2009). The average value of those units is \$214.47 per square foot. At this cost per square ft. sell price would equate to an approximate loss of \$68.600. Certainly the market has varied greatly in the past few months; however, the most recent sale, just last month, sold for \$232.84 per square foot. The applicant proposes to rehabilitate 24,311 ~~24,668~~ square feet of the 27,000 available square feet, or 90% ~~91.4%~~ of the existing building. To break even, the owner would need to make \$220.44 ~~\$217.25~~ per square foot. A reconsideration of the construction cost could mitigate or even eliminate this loss.

Staff finds that the additional explanation of at least five items would be helpful in substantiating the current construction estimate: interior layout, roofing, electrical, framing and tuck pointing.

Interior layout: The potential units have been devalued by not working with the existing layout and utilizing existing load-bearing walls. For example, a higher level of response to configuring units based on the existing space configurations might allow for a loft in a unit(s) located in the theater/gymnasium space (currently unit 6) and the use of hallways as living space, bathrooms or closets without removing load bearing walls. In addition, features such as original wainscoting, windows and doors are valued assets to buyers of historic properties and could be reused. The

Metro Codes Department has a Rehabilitation Committee that works with owners of older properties to meet the intent of the code but not necessarily the letter of the code, allowing an owner some flexibility in maintaining original features while still being code compliant.

Electrical (line item 32, \$56,778): Based on the construction of I-440 the applicant believes that they have rock two-feet (2') below grade and electrical lines are required to be buried four-feet (4') below ground. The electrical costs are high because of the assumed need of a ground-mounted transformer unit as opposed to multiple poles and need to bury lines underground but this may not be the only solution. For instance, it may be possible to bring in overhead lines and enter the buildings at two different locations in the rear with service running in crawl spaces thereby eliminating long runs and the need to bury lines. Staff recommends more exploration of actual costs for the electrical estimate.

Roofing (line item 20, \$22,435): The applicant has stated that a full new roof is necessary to warranty the construction and has estimated it at \$22,435 (line item 20) per unit or \$246,785 total. Using recent roofing estimates staff finds that a typical roof would cost approximately, \$93,000 (\$8,454 per unit) a total difference of \$153,785.

Framing (line item 18): The estimate for framing is \$42,177. Again, staff found that existing interior conditions were not creatively used which may be a reason for the high framing costs. Using existing conditions might also lessen the concrete footing material costs. The applicant has stated that their contractor expressed the need for new footings not only to meet code but also to provide support once interior load-bearing walls are removed.

Tuck pointing (line item 23, \$6,580): Staff would like to see more information on the estimated 20-40% of brick needing to be tuck pointed. Based on a recent site visit, staff evaluated that about 10% of the building needs tuck pointing. Although it is likely a minor cost, the design guidelines do not allow for non water based sealants, as provided for in this estimate, since they trap moisture inside the brick and can cause old brick to crack and spall.

In addition, the applicant has a "self-created" hardship due to the fact that the property had the historic preservation overlay at the time of purchase and so the applicant should not have assumed the buildings could be demolished.

Staff recommends disapproval and finds that the applicant has not made the case for the project not being viable based under valuing potential condominium units and creating their own hardship.

Several members of the public spoke in regards to the application:

Burkley Allen, 3521 Byron Avenue. Ms. Allen stated that the conservation district has been a valuable tool for the Commission. She requested that the Commission explain why the building is historic, despite modifications.

Kren Teren, 306 Elmington Avenue. Ms. Kren explained that when the property was put up for auction, contact information was included to learn more about what restrictions might have been on the building. She stated that the current owners did not do their due diligence to determine what could be done with the building before purchasing the property.

Nancy Chiltan, 3506 Byron Avenue. Ms. Chiltan claims that the amount of alterations and the current dilapidated state is not good for the neighborhood and lowers property values. Ms. Chiltan believes, that based on other condominium sales, that rehabilitation of this structure is not feasible.

Axson West, 3508 Byron Avenue. Mr. West told about his and his family's memories of the school and the neighborhood. He works for a development firm and ran his own numbers for rehabilitation. Considering the current economic environment, he is concerned that the project may become rental units even if condominiums are planned. He prefers a development of single-family units.

Jane Hardy, 208 Elmington Avenue. Ms. Hardy stated that she was a proponent of the historic overlay and the SP zoning, and supports preservation of the building. She explained that the requirement for preserving the building was in place when the building was purchased and should not be changed now.

John Haas, applicant, began his presentation by stating that in their due diligence, the terms of the SP zoning stated that demolition could be approved if there was an economic hardship, which is what they are attempting to demonstrate now.

Mr. Haas provided a ten page document. He explained that the first page was additional comps from January 1, 2009 and included buildings that were three-stories or less, in the zip codes of 37204, 37204, 37212, and constructed between 2005-2010. These comps resulted in an average per square foot value of \$207, the number they used in their analysis. However, stated Mr. Haas, staff provided comps that were said to be within a one mile radius when in truth they were within a two mile radius. In addition, one of the comps provided by staff is not a condominium but a town house.

Mr. Haas pointed out that staff used a list-price rather than a sales price in their analysis of value per square foot, as highlighted on page two of his submitted document. In addition, he claims that units for the analysis were picked for subjective reasons. He said that they [the applicants] had provided an objective, rather than subjective, sales price per square foot and that number equated to a value of \$205 per square foot.

Mr. Haas brought the Commission's attention to the highest priced unit shown in Staff's analysis which was the Whitney located in Green Hills. He pointed out that it is the furthest unit from their property and the sales price was \$358 a square foot. He instructed the Commission to consider the median rather than the average since this sale, which is one- and one-half times the average, tilts the numbers. Mr. Haas directed the Commission to the fourth sheet in his submittal, which is a map showing the location of comps.

Mr. Haas stated that, if Staff's analysis of \$214 per square foot was correct, the total loss would be \$145,233 as illustrated on the seventh page of the document he submitted.

Mr. Haas explained that some costs were omitted from the original submission but were now provided on page 8 of his submittal and included the interest to carry the loan, closing fees, and sales commissions, resulting in a loss of \$676,773.

There were five items that required additional clarification, as documented in the Staff Recommendation, and Mr. Haas offered to have people present information for clarification or he stated that they could be addressed in the Commission's questions and answers. He directed the Commission to the written cost estimate for the roof on the 9th page of his document. He stated that the thought Staff's numbers might have been for materials only and not labor but the submitted estimate included labor.

Commissioner Berry asked if they were proposing to demolish the entire building or just a portion. Mr. Haas replied that their proposal is to save the oldest portion which equates to about 2500 square feet.

Commissioner Berry requested a clarification of the mix of condominium units and condominiums. Mr. Haas explained that mixing the two was not feasible because of requirements of zoning and might not even be approvable by the Planning Commission. In addition, the plans they had submitted would devalue the single-family units because of the configuration and access.

Commissioner Mosley said that they could find seven people to tell them seven different things. He explained that with his experience in design and rehabilitation of older buildings and having walked through the building, he felt that the project could be accomplished in a manner that would result in a different bottom line.

Commissioner DeCuyper believed that the entire building was not being used in a creative manner that considered the reuse of existing materials and architectural elements that would keep the cost down and add value. He said that it was difficult to value a property on a price per square foot because you are selling something based on a pound and houses in that area are not sold by the pound but by the fit and finish and how it integrates into the neighborhood. You cannot simply look at a loft in Parthenon or Green Hills because they do not know the fit and finishes which determine value. As example, he discussed a recent sale of a near-condemned building on Gillespie that sold for half a

million dollars. It brought that much, explained Commissioner De Cuyper, because of the history of the building and its architectural elements.

Chairperson Nielson asked Commissioner DeCuyper to address the public's question as to why the building is considered historic. Commissioner DeCuyper explained that the majority of fabric is still there and that there are other buildings which have less historic fabric and yet still meet the criteria for significance.

Commissioner Tibbs stated that he wished he had Staff's rebuttal to the numbers provided by the applicant. He asked Staff if this was their first time to see the information provided by the applicants during the meeting. Ms. Zeigler said it was but that some of the information had been discussed on the phone the night before. Commissioner Tibbs said the building's character is valuable and that its history is rich.

Mr. Haas explained that there was no rebuttal needed from Staff as in his analysis they had accepted Staff's evaluation of value and the only number Staff had not seen was the cost to carry the loan.

Commissioner Ponder stated the condition of the building was poor and asked Commissioner DeCuyper if he believed the building could be a single-family home that could bring large dollars. Commissioner DeCuyper explained that the complex was too large for one single-family residence but that the shape of the building would work well for several.

Commissioner Turner asked if there was any potential use other than residential and Chairperson Nielson explained that the zoning only allowed for residential.

Commissioner Berry asked if the self-created hardship was a legal consideration or just a factor to be considered. Mr. Sloan advised that the costs the owners paid for the property is a consideration but what weight to give that was up to the commission.

Commissioner Ponder stated that if nothing happens the property will get worse. Commissioners Mosley and De Cuyper explained that if they made a decision based on that criteria alone, that would encourage land grabs of historic properties during bad economic times with the purpose of demolishing them or neglecting historic properties until demolition was the only option.

Mr. Haas explained that their intent was to build in some market protection by constructing a range of units and that they had used 90% of the structure. He stated that they were handcuffed by the zoning code proposed by the Council and the neighborhood that only allows for residential. His clients have invested \$100,000 to prove with numbers, floor plans and estimates that the numbers do not work. Commissioner De Cuyper stated that they knew the restrictions when they purchased the property.

Mr. Sloan said that the zoning code defines the different issues the Commission should consider. He advised that they look at the market value, not necessarily what was paid for the property.

Commissioner Berry asked about the proposed street configuration. Mr. Haas explained that almost one-quarter of the property was unusable because the building was set back so far; however, if they saved the oldest part of the building, the street alignment would meet the open space requirements as well as all other conditions in the SP zoning.

Commissioner Ponder asked if the buildings could be torn down and the property subdivided into smaller lots. Chairperson Nielson and Mr. Sloan explained that subdivision of the property would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Mr. Haas further clarified by stating that no matter who the owners were, new construction would still need to be approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Tibbs requested a definition of economic hardship. Ms. Zeigler explained that the Supreme Court had identified it as taking all reasonable use or return of the property. Mr. Sloan advised that the Metro Code identifies what factors can be considered and that the Commission should look at all factors.

Commissioner Mosley requested the total estimated investment considering all cost. Mr. Haas stated that it was approximately 5.8 million dollars. He clarified that it was their intent to preserve a portion of the building. Commissioner Berry asked if that could be a condition of the demolition and Mr. Sloan replied that it could.

Commissioner Berry moved and Commissioner Ponder seconded to approve economic hardship with the condition that a portion of the building be preserved as shown in the application and material be reused to the greatest extent possible on the basis that the applicant has met the conditions of section 17.40.420, subsection D, 1 and 3 of the zoning code.

There was a brief discussion and clarification of the motion. The motion failed with only two votes in favor.

Motion

Commissioner Mosley moved to disapprove the application and Commissioner DeCuyper seconded. Motion passed with six in favor and two dissenting votes.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Zeigler asked that the approval of a revised “Rules of Order and Procedure” be removed from the agenda as there is additional information that should be added and Staff would rather bring it to the Commission as a complete document.

Ms. Zeigler noted that the Commission had received a list of Preservation Permits which had been issued by MHZC staff in the preceding month.

Commissioner DeCuyper moved to adjourn the meeting; the Motion was seconded by Commissioner Turner. It passed unanimously.

Metropolitan Historical Commission does not discriminate on the basis of age, race, sex, color, national origin, religion, or disability in admission to, access to, or operations of its programs, services, or activities. The commission does not discriminate in its hiring or employment practices. The following person has been designated to handle questions, concerns, complaints, requests for accommodation, or requests for additional information regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act: Yvonne Ogren, 3000 Granny White Pike, Nashville, TN 37204 phone: (615) 862-7970, fax: (615) 862-7974. The following person has been designated as the Metropolitan Government Title VI Coordinator to handle questions, concerns, complaints, or requests for additional information regarding Title VI of The Civil Rights Act: Shirley Sims-Saldana, Metro Human Relations Commission, 800 Second Avenue, South, 4th Floor; Nashville, TN 37210, phone: (615) 880-3391. Inquiries concerning non-discrimination policies other than ADA and Title VI compliance should be forwarded to: Metro Human Relations Commission, 800 Second Avenue, South, 4th Floor; Nashville, TN 37210, phone: (615) 880-3391.

DRAFT